REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-45 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-21 and 32-45 are rejected over prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Claim 22-31 are allowable. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the rejected claims based on the remarks and arguments presented below.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-21, 32-42, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,845,238 to Muller (hereinafter Muller) in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,252 to Jetzek et al. (hereinafter Jetzek) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,266 to Shohara (hereinafter Shohara). Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Muller in view of Jetzek and Shohara, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,956,895 to Vihriala (hereinafter Vihriala).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or references when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections because the combination of prior art references fail to teach or suggest every claimed limitation.

Claim 1 recites a method that includes "configuring a frequency tracking loop for receiving a second wireless signal from the second carrier as a function of the frequency estimation information." The frequency estimation information is obtained from a first wireless signal.

The Examiner concedes that Muller fails to describe configuring a frequency tracking loop for receiving a second wireless signal from the second carrier as a function of the frequency estimation information. *See, Office Action*, dated August 22, 2006, at pages 2-3. However, the Examiner alleges that Jetzek "disclose configuring [sic] for receiving a second wireless signal from the second carrier as a function of the frequency information." *Id.*, at page 2. The

Examiner contends that Jetzek describes the frequency estimation information comprises a frequency offset. Further, the Examiner contends that Shohara describes a frequency tracking loop.

However, Applicant contends that the Examiner has mischaracterized Jetzek. Jetzek fails to describe frequency estimation information. Instead, Jetzek describes "mobile station measures the *transmission quality Q_{F1} on frequency f_1 and estimates the quality Q_{F2} on frequency f_2* by adding an offset Q_{F12} to the measured transmission quality Q_{F1}." *Jetzek*, at Col. 3, ll. 1-4, and FIG. 3 (*emphasis added*).

Jetzek fails to describe measuring or estimating a frequency. In contrast, Jetzek describes measuring a *signal quality* in a first frequency band. Jetzek describes examples of signal quality. In the detailed description, Jetzek describes a measured *power level* as the signal quality and states: "According to this method the mobile station, or the base transceiver station, if the handoff decisions are made therein, is informed of the *power level offset* between a Perch channel 1 transmitted on frequency band f_1 and a Perch channel 2 on frequency band f_2. Since the mobile station is already measuring the Perch channel 1 on frequency band f_1, the determination of whether the frequency band f_2 provides an acceptable signal quality can take into account this *power level offset*." *Id.*, at Col. 4, ll. 59-67 (*emphasis added*).

Jetzek describes additional examples of signal quality and states:

> One of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the transmission quality that is used for comparing frequencies can be of several types. For example, in WCDMA system, the received energy per chip divided by the noise power density in the frequency band may be utilized (Ec/No). In addition, the received signal code power divided by the interference signal code power may also be utilized which may be referred to as the signal-to-interference ratio (SIR). The SIR may be defined as the Received Signal Code Power (RSCP) divided by the Interference Signal Code Power (ISCP). Furthermore, the pathloss may be utilized (i.e., the received signal code power minus the transmitted power). *Id.*, at Col. 5 line 61 through Col. 6, line 6.

Jetzek fails to describe frequency estimation or a frequency offset in any of the examples of signal quality. Indeed, FIG. 3 from Jetzek illustrates quality in terms of dB, a unit that is normally associated with power and not normally associated with frequency.

Jetzek fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of generating frequency estimation information or of configuring a frequency tracking loop for a second wireless signal based on the frequency estimation information from a first wireless signal. Indeed, the portion of Jetzek cited

by the Examiner, Col. 6, ll. 24-31, describe measuring downlink (DL) transmission quality at a first frequency and discuss estimating a signal quality at a second frequency. A portion of Jetzek cited by the Examiner describes how "The offset may be a function of the ratio of the DL *transmission power on frequency band f_1* compared to the DL *transmission power used on frequency band f_2*. For example, a straightforward solution to calculating the offset is to take the ratio of DL transmission power on frequency band f_2 with respect to the one used on frequency band f_1." *Id.*, at Col. 6, ll. 28-34 (*emphasis added*). Thus, in contrast to the Examiner's contention, Jetzek describes measuring signal quality, such as received power. Jetzek fails to describe measuring or otherwise determining a frequency estimate and fails to describe configuring a frequency tracking loop as a function of the frequency estimation information.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, because the cited references, whether alone or in combination, fails to teach or describe all claimed features.

Claims 11, 32, and 42 include similar features to those discussed above in relation to claim 1. For example, claim 11 features "configuring a frequency tracking loop for receiving a second wireless signal from the second carrier as a function of the frequency estimation information." Claim 32 features "means for configuring a frequency tracking loop for receiving a second wireless signal from the second carrier as a function of the frequency estimation information." Claim 42 features "configuring a frequency tracking loop for receiving a second wireless signal operating at a second carrier based at least in part on the frequency error of the first wireless signal." Thus, claims 11, 32, and 42 are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons presented above in relation to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 11, 32, and 42.

Claims 2-10, 12-21, 33-41, and 43-45 depend from one of claims 1, 11, 32, or 42 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reason that they depend from an allowable base claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-10, 12-21, 33-41, and 43-45.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all claims pending in the application are allowable. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 15, 2006

By: /Howard H. Seo/
Howard H. Seo
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,106

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-2779
Telephone: (858) 651-8546
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

60884715 v1